<u>REMARKS</u>

Regarding independent claims 45 and 48 and a restriction requirement issued in this case, it appears that the Examiner has agreed with Applicants previous arguments since claims 45 and 48 (which have never been canceled by Applicants) are now listed as pending and addressed in the rejection.

Further, in the present Office Action, the Examiner: (i) rejected claims 3 and 4 under §112, first paragraph; (ii) rejected claims 1, 2, 5-12, 28, 45 and 48 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,848,130 to Rochkind (hereinafter "Rochkind"); and (iii) rejected claims 30-32 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,664,227 to Mauldin et al. (hereinafter "Mauldin") in view of Rochkind.

In this response, Applicants traverse the various §102 and §103 rejections. Nonetheless, in an effort to move the present application through to issuance, Applicants have amended certain of the independent claims to further clarify the invention.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, Applicants have canceled such claims thus making the §112, first paragraph, rejection moot.

Regarding independent claims 1, 30, 45 and 50, Applicants have added the limitation of "marking a portion of the information signal in response to a user input such that at least one content detection step is performed on the marked portion of the information signal to detect whether the marked portion of the information signal includes particular content." This feature is substantially taken from dependent claim 11, which has now been canceled. Applicants further note that independent claims 28 and 48 already had a marking feature, however, Applicants have further clarified that the marking is done for a portion of the information signal.

The Office Action cites Rochkind at column 5, lines 12 and 13, in rejecting the claimed marking feature. However, Rochkind discloses no such feature. Column 5, lines 12 and 13, of Rochkind refers to the user being able, as an option, to enable or disable the "enhanced intelligibility mode." However, this is not the same as marking a portion of the information signal in response to a user input such that at least one content detection step is performed on the marked portion of the information signal to detect whether the marked portion of the information signal includes particular content, as claimed.

7

First, the option in Rochkind allows the user only to enable or disable the slow-rate playback of detected numbers over the entire message. This is clear from column 5, lines 15-18, of Rochkind. The setting option does not allow the user to mark a portion of the message.

Second, the claimed marking step is performed "such that at least one content detection step is performed on the marked portion of the information signal to detect whether the marked portion of the information signal includes particular content." That is, the claimed invention marks the portion of the information signal on which the user wants content detection to be performed. As FIG. 6 of Rochkind illustrates, content detection is performed on the message regardless of the setting of the "enhanced intelligibility mode" flag. That is, as can be seen, step 610 discloses retrieving the message and the position bit string. The position bit string is the result of content detection (see FIG. 4 of Rochkind). Then, in the subsequent step 620, the method considers the "enhanced intelligibility mode" flag. Thus, it cannot be said that the setting of the flag marks a portion of the message on which the user wants content detection to be performed since, even if the flag is not set (disabled), the position bit string already exists according to FIG. 6.

Regarding the §103 rejection based on Mauldin and Rochkind, Applicants assert that Mauldin also fails to teach the claimed marking feature.

For at least the above reasons, and the reasons presented in Applicants' previous responses, Applicants assert that claims 1, 2, 5-12, 28, 30-32, 45, 48, 50 are patentable over Rochkind and the Mauldin/Rochkind combination.

It is also asserted that the dependent claims of the present application recite patentable subject matter in their own right. By way of example only, Rochkind does not disclose that the presentation speed is controlled in accordance with detection of specific content classes in the information signal, as recited in dependent claim 6. The Office Action cites the bottom of column 3 and the top of column 4 of Rochkind. However, this section of Rochkind only lists examples of spoken numbers (e.g., single digit number, multi-digit number) for which the Rochkind method searches. It is does not disclose specific content classes upon which presentation speed can be controlled. That is, even if one where to consider a single digit number to be a different class of content than a multi-digit number (which Applicants do not believe is being suggested in Rochkind),

no where does Rochkind disclose that the presentation speed is controlled in any different manner based on whether a single digit number or a multi-digit number is detected.

In view of the above, Applicants believe that claims 1, 2, 5-12, 28, 30-32, 45, 48, 50 are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request withdrawal of the §102(b) and §103(a) rejections.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: March 8, 2006

William E. Lewis
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 39,274
Ryan, Mason & Lewis, LLP
90 Forest Avenue
Locust Valley, NY 11560
(516) 759-2946